



Trans-Lake Washington Project

Washington State
Department of Transportation
Sound Transit

Public Input For Weeks of February 17 to March 11, 2001

Date of Comment: March 6, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: Is a bike lane an option on any of the 520 alternatives? I'd love to commute by bike and if it were an option on the table I'd love to know what I could do to support that proposal.

Date of Comment: March 6, 2001

Subjects: Project and public involvement.

Comment: We've got some ideas to share and we want to hear your thoughts! Unlike people from nearly all other communities, people from Kirkland, by and large, are nearly forced to use the massively congested 520 bridge—other options are much more difficult than they are for someone from, say, Bellevue. People from Kirkland need help crossing Lake Washington more than any other community. Yet it amazes me how few of these meetings are held in Kirkland!

Date of Comment: March 1, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane, HOV lane and HCT.

Comment: It is imperative that when you choose one of the options on SR 520- that you don't forget to add SOV lanes! A proven fact that HOV lanes are a joke- I-405 is an example. Get it right this time! Build more SOV lanes for everyone else! Good compromise is at least 3 SOV lanes in each direction! Mass transit is a joke- one more way of sucking up billions of dollars. Buses are good enough- it is frustrating commuting out there. Build SOV lanes!

Date of Comment: March 1, 2001

Subjects: Public involvement

Summary of Comment: He saw our ad in the PI and wanted to know if we would like to advertise with his radio station (Joy returned his call and told him we would keep his number on hand).

Date of Comment: February 22, 2001

Subjects: Tolls and impacts.

Comment: I am planning to attend the 3/6 meeting at MOHAI. It will be my first. I'm hoping to become more involved. I live in the area and take 520 two –three times a week in the evenings for recreational purposes. I don't commute to work on 520, however. My concern regards tolls. My understanding is that tolls would serve as a disincentive for single passenger

cars. Maybe so. Perhaps they would also pay for improvements. However, how effective would tolls be in mitigating congestion and what happens to the environment if tolls, and therefore tollbooths are established? I'm originally from the NY metropolitan area. I go back there annually. I know about tolls. I know about the horrendous back-ups that occur as people wait to go through the tollbooths, no matter if there is an express decal on the car. The back-ups occur. And then there is the pollution from the exhaust emitted from waiting cars. It's a nightmare, and something I don't think is in our best interests. Has an EIS been done that addresses the pollution issue? Has there been a study to determine the "real" effects that tolls have on traffic? I hope these questions will be addressed at the meeting or that I can get a response to these questions via email. Thank you.

Date of Comment: March 8, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, project, public involvement, bicycle/pedestrian lane, lids, and transit.

Comment: I've thought about the since concept design plans for SR 520 expansion were presented at MOHAI 36 hours ago. It gives me no pleasure whatsoever to say that I am deeply troubled. Therefore I do not believe that the Montlake portion of the project is ready for detailed design. (As in previous communications, I represent only myself in this note).

Noise and Pollution: Widening SR 520 to 6 or 8 lanes will increase noise and pollution concomitantly. Yet the only identifiable mitigation of the noise is a 1-block-long lid, which benefits the houses along its perimeter and no one else. Neighborhoods such as the rest of Montlake, Laurelhurst, and Eastlake will not see any mitigation of increased noise and pollution whatsoever. I urge to you to locate the key sources of SR 520-related noise in the region. My guess is that you'll find that most of the troublesome noise arises in a 1-mile-long stretch of SR-520 eastward from I-5. If I'm correct then mitigation of noise will require a solution of this size scale.

I believe that you should consider a greenhouse or conservatory style enclosure of SR 520 from the high rise to I-5 with tight controls on noise and pollution (the MCC suggested this earlier). Please also reconsider my suggestion of a permanent trust fund for resurfacing the SR 520 with fresh, low noise surface whenever noise reaches a threshold and for maintaining plantings. We have ample precedent not to trust WSDOT to provide such services routinely. Lid: The architect's concept for institutional buildings on or around the lid was an unfortunate. It shows that the project is completely unaware of the amply articulated desires of the neighborhood. The architect should have known that Montlake is a residential neighborhood, and fights hard to keep it that way. The idea of clusters of institutional buildings (with attendant traffic - as if U.W. doesn't exist!) is abhorrent. His lid concept will require a new layer of project mitigation, not to mention the unnecessary [ire] of the Montlake community.

The transit concept is more appealing, and I continue to support it as a high use for the lid. However, the sketch of the hub shown the other night is grossly inadequate in capacity. To serve as a hub not only for SR 520 busses, but future N-S bus transit and U.W. shuttles -- as would be critical for the hub to be effective at decreasing local congestion -- you will need to increase the

size of the lid and to provide preferential transit access between the hub and Montlake Boulevard.

Land Use: As you know, Montlake's long-standing policy is to oppose the appropriation of land for roads. Your plans show that the project tried hard to be sensitive to this problem. However, I don't really think that the effort was successful. It may be useful to look at double decking.

Cross lake bike and pedestrian access: If pedestrian and bike accommodations are provided along SR 520 (I didn't notice any the other night) then plantings to enhance the appearance of SR 520 should be included.

Tunnel to U.W.: The most exciting part of the presentation was the tunnel that permits traffic to reach U.W. and short circuit Montlake Boulevard. As you know, this tunnel has been proposed twice before, and each time it was considered technically infeasible (steep grades and soils problems) or prohibitively expensive. I urge you to either put the tunnel in the plans irrevocably and, hence, to design the Montlake interchange around it, or to drop it right away. If it becomes part of the design but is not eventually implemented, the effect on Montlake traffic congestion is, well, terrifying. I might add that my neighbors and I will vigorously oppose a bridge replacement for the tunnel. We already have more than enough noise from the Montlake Bridge. And if the replacement bridge doesn't have a draw span for ships then the height of this bridge will be an eyesore, not to mention the problem of safe grades for busses. In addition, the bridge will displace lots of U.W. parking, meaning further development of new U.W. parking lots in a very environmentally sensitive area.

Project-Neighborhood communication: The Montlake Community Council has repeatedly offered to establish a working group of Montlake residents to assist you with ideas and reactions. I urge you to accept this offer immediately. I also think that the March 6 presentation was very poorly publicized, and that a uniform mailing or an insert in the Montlake Flyer should have been utilized. Finally, please be aware that I have slipped off the e-mailing list for design meetings.

Date of Comment: March 9, 2001

Subjects: Project

Comment: Hello, My mother reports that four preliminary sketches of new roads, interchanges, and revisions of traffic in the Montlake near the 520 and Montlake Boulevard interchange were shown at the recent info meeting (3/6/1 at MOHAI). How can I obtain copies of these preliminary blueprints for further examination?

Date of Comment: March 11, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, tunnel, and alternatives.

Comment: I strongly protest tentative plans for the SR 520 tunnel; much of what Eastlake has worked to enhance and preserve, as well as already funded projects, would be destroyed. I don't want to be a NIMBY, but surely there are other alternatives.
